

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,972	03/23/2005	Justus Lamprecht	3153	1475
7590 07/21/2006		EXAMINER		
Striker Striker & Stenby 103 East Neck Road			RACHUBA, MAURINA T	
Huntington, NY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<i>5</i> ,			3723	
			DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/528,972	LAMPRECHT ET AL.	LAMPRECHT ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		M Rachuba	3723		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addres	s	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13° SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we use to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this commur BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	·				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.			
3)	• •	•	, ,	rits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.			
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.				
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.			
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2005 is/are: a	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ol	ejected to by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	*			
44)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•			
11)[_	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-18	52.	
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents		A 11 11 1 A		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		· ·		
	 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 	•	n received in this National Stag	je	
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	t received		
			. 100011001		
Attachmen		_			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date		
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 3/23/05.		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Application/Control Number: 10/528,972 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-8, 11, 12, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Shotwell, 3,968,843. Please refer to figures 1-3 and their descriptions. Regarding the limitations "in particular a handheld right-angle grinder" or "in particular for a grinding or cutting wheel", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Here, there is no structural difference between the handle structure of '843 and that of applicant's claimed handle, other than its use with a different type of hand tool.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 3723

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 5. Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shotwell, 3,968,843. '843 discloses that the mount is formed of metal, such as steel, but does not disclose that the mount is formed of plastic, with a metal part injected into it. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the mount or any other part of the invention of plastic reinforced with metal, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Here, one of ordinary skill knows that plastic with metal reinforcement provides a strong, yet lightweight part.
- 6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shotwell 3,968,843 in view of Buettner, DD 151893 A. '843 does not disclose the mount having bayonet hooks as an additional fastening of the mount to the motor housing. '893 see the enclosed abstract, teaches that it is old and well known to provide an attachment to a housing with bayonet hooks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided '843 with the bayonet hooks taught by '893, to allow a quick fastening and release of the mount to the housing.

Application/Control Number: 10/528,972 Page 4

Art Unit: 3723

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shotwell 3,968,843 in view of Naslund et al, 5,361,500. '843 does not disclose a central bearing journal and/or a live ring for pivotably adjustable fastening of the handle. '500, in a similar tool, teaches a central bearing journal, figure 1, **15, 17**, for pivotably adjustable fastening of the handle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have provided '843 with the central bearing journal of '500, to allow the handle to be pivotally adjustable while still being dampened, as taught by '500, column 1, lines 53 through column 2, lines 10.

Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Other similar damping devices are cited of interest.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M Rachuba whose telephone number is 571-272-4493.
 The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/528,972

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> M Rachuba **Primary Examiner**

Page 5

Art Unit 3723